

Appl. No.: 10/603,913
Reply to Office Action of: 03/26/2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al. (US 7,181,172). Claims 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 7,181,172) in view of Politycki et al. (US 3,767,538). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 7,181,172) and Politycki et al. (US 3,767,538) in view of Murakami et al. (US 4,239,813). Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 7,181,172) and Politycki et al. (US 3,767,538) in view of Nishihara et al. (US 5,118,458). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Sullivan fails to teach each and every element as set forth in claims 1 and 33 for at least the reasons described below.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the integral connector structure is configured to receive at least a portion of a connecting member of the electronic component therein". In contrast, Sullivan merely discloses a wireless device 400 comprising electrical circuitry molded into an internal space 502 of a panel 404. The electrical circuitry in Sullivan provides the electrical supply for the components (antenna 504, battery 508, etc.).

Appl. No.: 10/603,913
Reply to Office Action of: 03/26/2007

The connection between these components and the circuitry is by way of contacts (see for example the contacts 504c in Fig. 5, and the charging circuit 506 in Figs. 5-6). Sullivan does not disclose or suggest forming an integral connector structure within the internal space 502. Thus, Sullivan fails to teach a "process comprising forming an electronic device cover member ... and providing on the cover member an integral connector structure for connecting the electrical circuitry to an electronic component, wherein the integral connector structure is configured to receive at least a portion of a connecting member of the electronic component therein", as claimed in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 2-20, and 34 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Applicants have amended claim 33 to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the connector structure is configured to receive at least a portion of a connecting member of the electronic component therein". Similar to the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Sullivan to provide any type of a connector structure, let alone a connector structure integrally formed with the molded front panel 402 or back panel 404 of the cell phone 400. Therefore, Sullivan fails to teach a "process comprising ... providing on the cover member a connector structure for connecting the electrical circuitry to an electronic

Appl. No.: 10/603,913
Reply to Office Action of: 03/26/2007

component, wherein the connector structure is integrally formed with the cover member during the incorporating of the electrical circuitry into the cover member during the forming of the cover member, and wherein the connector structure is configured to receive at least a portion of a connecting member of the electronic component therein" as claimed in amended claim 33. Accordingly, claim 33 is patentable over the art of record and should be allowed.

Though dependent claim 35 contains allowable subject matter, this claim should at least be allowable due to its dependence from allowable claim 33. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

MAY. 16. 2007 11:59AM

HARRINGTON & SMITH

NO. 805 P. 10

Appl. No.: 10/603,913
Reply to Office Action of: 03/26/2007

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington

Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

5/16/07

Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

5/16/2007
Date

Elaine F. Main
Name of Person Making Deposit